Appln No. 09/693317 Amdt. Dated: September 11, 2006

Response to Office Action of July 11, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

4

In response to the Official Action of July 11, 2006, Applicant encloses a Request for

Continuing Examination together with the prescribed fee. The supporting submissions are

set out below.

Applicant submits that the enclosed RCE fully complies with 37 CFR 1.114 and therefore

asks that the finality of the last report be withdrawn.

Amendments

The claims have been amended to define the scanner's fault tolerant decoding ability. The

decoder will continue to decode several duplicate copies of the digitally encoded image data

until it has successfully decoded the entire image.

These features are discussed in detail from page 12, lines 6-9. Accordingly, the amendments

do not add any new matter.

Submissions

35 USC §103

Previously presented claims 2 to 6 stand rejected as obvious in light of US 6,304,345 to

Patton et al, and US 6,894,794 to Patton et al in view of US 6,160,642 to Mui et al.

Currently amended claim 6 introduces the robust decoding capability of the scanner. The bit

image of data read by the invisible ink scanner is encoded with enough resolution to contain

several duplicate copies if the visible image data. Should some of the data be obliterated

because of wear and tear to the original photograph, the decoder attempts to decode a second

copy of the encoded data. If that is also unsuccessful it decodes a third copy and so on until

the processor has all the print data for the visible image. This ensures that the printed visible

image is equivalent to the original photograph when first printed even if large portions of the

photograph have been damaged or worn.

Appln No. 09/693317 Amdt. Dated: September 11, 2006 Response to Office Action of July 11, 2006

5

None of the cited references teach redundant encoding of the image data for the purposes of successfully decoding data for the entire visible image. Accordingly, the citations do not support a §103 rejection of amended claim 6. Likewise, claims 2-5 are also distinguished from the prior art by virtue of their dependence from claim 6.

Conclusion

In light of the above, the Applicant submits that all rejections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the present application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:

lusz

Kia Silverbrook

Paul Lapstun

Simon Robert Walmsley

C/o:

Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd

393 Darling Street

Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email:

kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone:

+612 9818 6633

Facsimile:

+61 2 9555 7762